

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,706	0	06/21/1999	SUMIYO OKADA	21.1924/JRB	7969
21171	7590	11/28/2006		EXAMINER	
STAAS & H	IALSEY	LLP		PRIETO, I	BEATRIZ
SUITE 700					, . <del></del>
1201 NEW Y	ORK AV	ENUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON DC 20005				2142	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	09/336,706	OKADA ET AL.						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Prieto B.	2142	•					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess					
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).					
6. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	•	•						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) in how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided to the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none.  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,16,17 and 26-36.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 13-15 18-25.		l <del>be entered and an ex</del>	<del>planation o</del> f					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  3. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t hefore or on the date of filing a No	atice of Appeal will not	ho ontorod					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is i	necessary and					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	to provide a					
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	d.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	e because:					
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13.								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request for reconsideration and/or petition for withdrawal of finality of final office action has been fully considered. In this case, applicant [AS BEST UNDERSTOOD] argues that the "Response to Notice" of October 25, 2005 did not amend the claims and thereby did not raise any new issues, and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103 are new grounds for rejection (mailed 9/14/06) introduced new grounds of rejection that was not necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims. However, applicant's "Response to Notice" was not a response to a rejection to amendment filed 10/03/05, it was a "Response to Notice" in which examiner requested applicant's cooperation as where in the disclosure the amendment filed is supported in order to applied a proper interpretation to the claimed language. The office action mailed 10/25/05 to which applicant replied with the above-mentioned "Response to Notice" contained no rejection to the claims as shown on the respective attached PTOL-326 disposition of the claims, and the respective attached "Detailed Action" (p. 2-4) does not contain any rejection of the claims in response to amendment filed 10/03/05. Applicant acknowledged there is no rejection in the office action mailed 10/25/05 because he/she traversed examiner's request to point out where the amendment filed 10/03/05 is supported in the specification and requested the "reexamination of the application" (see p. 2). Thus, the final office action containing a rejection of the claims as amendment (filed 10/03/03 where clms 1-2, 31 and new claim 36 was added) seems proper. Rejection and finality of office action mailed 9/14/06 is

BEATHIZ PRIETO PRIMARY EXAMINER